MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 17, 1940

The ninth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1940, was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, Friday, May 17, 1940. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
Dr. Cret,
Mr. Holabird,
Mr. Bruce,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held March 29, 1940, were approved.

2. APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENT: The secretary reported that the President had reappointed Mr. Clarke member of the Commission of Fine Arts, effective April 18, 1940. The Commission also welcomed into the membership, Dr. Cret, appointed by the President, effective April 25, 1940, and Mr. John A. Holabird, effective May 3, 1940.

3. MEMORIAL MEDAL FOR GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT: Under date of May 16, 1940, the following letter was received from Hon. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint:

May 16, 1940.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I am forwarding to you, by messenger, the model of the medal commemorating the 300th anniversary of the founding of the City of Greenwich, Connecticut, together with two photographs of the model.

The model is submitted to your Commission with a request for an opinion as to the artistic merits of the design. The inscription to appear on the reverse of the medal is as follows: "Authorized by the Congress of the United States of America, May 13, 1940."

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Nellie Tayloe Ross,
Director of the Mint.

The model was inspected by Mr. Manship. It was noted that the sculptor was Paul Fuelde of Riverside, Connecticut. Mr. Manship and Mr. Savage criticized the model as follows: it lacks distinguished medallic character; is pictorial rather than sculptural; the pattern is insufficient for the space and the linear composition is dry and sterile. Also the scale is too fine and elaborate for reduction.

The Commission concurred in these criticisms and a report was sent to the Director of the Mint accordingly. (Exhibit A)

4. PORTRAIT OF FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER: The secretary presented three additional applications from three additional artists to paint the portrait of President Hoover, as follows: John Doctoroff, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois; Howard E. Smith, Rockport, Massachusetts; and Graham Cootes, who was recommended by Hon. A. Willis Robertson. Mr. Savage submitted a list of five portrait painters of national reputation, as follows, from which list one could be selected to paint the portrait of Mr. Hoover:

Wayman Adams
Louis Betts
Charles Hopkinson
Ernest Ipsen
John C. Johansen

This list had been sent to the members of the Commission prior to the meeting. The Chairman called attention to the letter from Senator Barkley, as follows, suggesting that Mr. Hoover be consulted in this matter:

May 8, 1940.

My dear Mr. Clarke:

Replying to your letter of February 27, relative to the oil portrait of former President Herbert Hoover for the White House, I beg to say that while the appropriation has not been made, I would be glad to have a recommendation. I feel also that Mr. Hoover should be consulted.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Alben W. Barkley.

After discussion the Commission decided to recommend the artists mentioned in this list from Mr. Savage and send it to Senator Barkley, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, with the suggestion that the list be forwarded to Mr. Hoover to secure his selection of an artist. A report was sent to Senator Barkley accordingly. (Exhibit B)

5. SCULPTURE FOR THE SOCIAL SECURITY BUILDING; SCULPTURE AND PAINTING FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING; SCULPTURE AND MURAL PAINTINGS FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Mr. Bruce as Chief of the Section of Fine Arts, Public Buildings Administration, Federal Works Agency, had submitted photographs of models for sculpture for the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Building. Preliminary models had previously been considered by the Commission and Mr. Manship had given consideration to these photographs which Mr. Bruce submitted.

Mr. Manship was not particularly satisfied with all of the revised models as indicated by the photographs and said he wanted to talk with the Commission about them before Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Simon came into the meeting.

Mr. Manship's principal complaint was that these relief panels had not been properly considered in connection with the architecture of the building. Mr. Manship said he had called attention to this a few weeks ago when he sent a letter to Mr. Clarke on the subject (copy of which had been sent to each member of the Commission). (Exhibit C) Mr. Manship thought the model showing the

engineer and fireman better in design than the second model, of which he said, "I think it is especially unfortunate in relief to turn a head to show the three-quarters rear view, and the figure of the man is out of proportion." Mr. Bruce said his own office considered the subject of the model proper for the Railroad Retirement Building, that it was made after much thought and many sketches. He said that the artists were "keen" about the ideology of it, which had been considered pursuant to suggestions made by Paul McNutt, Administrator of the Social Security Agency.

Mr. Manship did not like the designs of the panels by Emma Lou Davis.

It was then noted from a blueprint that these sculptures would go over doors and would be carved in red granite; also that these reliefs would be in a shadow and would scarcely be seen. Thereupon Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Simon came into the meeting. They presented blue prints of the facade, which were inspected and the location of the sculptural reliefs again noted. Mr. Lamb said: "As this thing is here you will never see it; it will be three or four feet deep; the only thing to do is to make the background polished. They did this sort of thing on the great walls of Egypt." Mr. Manship explained that they colored the reliefs and that the incised drawing served to mark the boundaries of the color pattern. Mr. Lamb then pointed out that when red granite is polished it becomes darker. There was some question about the polish wearing off. Mr. Simon commented: "I saw a piece lying up in a yard in Connecticut that had been there for 40 years out in the open, and the polish was just like steel." Mr. Bruce asked if it would be feasible to polish the background. It was explained that the whole stone would be polished and the design incised afterwards. Mr. Lamb said that he would polish the stone the same as you do the architrave of the door. Mr. Simon thought it would be well to take a little piece of granite and let the

sculptor try it and see what the result is. It was decided to close the matter by recommending polished or honed stone, the figures to be left in matte. A report was sent to Mr. Reynolds accordingly. (Exhibit C-1)

The Commission thereupon discussed the matter of art in Federal buildings thoroughly. Mr. Savage asked Mr. Clarke if he could make a request of the Fine Arts Section that they send small scale models studied in architectural relationship. Mr. Clarke then said to Mr. Bruce: "We will request your people, through Mr. Reynolds, to submit these sketches for both mural painting and sculpture drawn to show the relationship between the architecture and the sculpture or murals, or whatever it may be." Mr. Manship felt that that would help all around. Mr. Bruce said that every time they have a competition now there is a model. Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Bruce: "When you have a competition and choose some artist, you have that person restudy the design?" Mr. Bruce replied that they have a scale model. Mr. Clarke then said, "The time we should see it is in advance of the model stage." Mr. Bruce replied, "In principle I am very much in accordance with you. I would love to have the Commission of Fine Arts see how this thing works out." In regard to the submission for the Social Security it was pointed out that the models had already been made to half size and the sculptors had received their first payment. Mr. Clarke stressed his point by saying, "What we are interested in is in seeing this thing before they make a three-quarter scale model. If we are going to serve our purpose here, our suggestions ought to be considered. Suppose we address a letter to Mr. Reynolds with the suggestion that the Commission see these submissions after the jury has passed on them; offer our suggestions at that time and not wait until they go any further." Mr. Reynolds then asked: "The question I want to

bring up is that when you study a matter of sculpture, in what form do you want that drawing to come in?" Mr. Manship replied that if the Commission could see a model of the building with a model of the sculpture to go on it, then it could form an intelligent judgment. "We don't want to be in a position to turn down something that is already finished. But now for this building, it is too late, and we had best accept the work presented in spite of its not being very satisfactory."

The Commission felt it desirable to inform Mr. Reynolds of this by official letter, namely, that a small scale model be submitted showing the sculpture in architectural relationship to the building, as has been done for proposed mural paintings. Mr. Bruce said this would be a help although there will be some practical difficulties.

Mr. Clarke said: "I don't think that a competition should be more than to choose an artist; then if there are any changes, they could be made from that preliminary study. We are not interested until the Public Buildings Office selects an artist. Then that artist should submit his sketches to the Commission of Fine Arts in a preliminary state. It is perfectly useless for the Commission to sit in judgment on something that is 'fait accompli'."

Mr. Bruce said: "I do not feel that a work of art is much better than the place where it is arranged to stand. Our biggest problem from the standpoint of the architecture is to have the architect provide suitable spaces for art work. Ninety-nine per cent of our work is post office work. From an architectural point of view our biggest problem is to have the architect make his designs so as to provide suitable spaces for sculpture and painting." Mr. Manship remarked that this shows lack of collaboration with the architect; that the building is almost out of the architect's hands when the sculptor is called in.

Mr. Clarke called attention to the fact that in the case of the murals the Commission has always had the cartoons first and asked why that should not also obtain for the sculpture. Mr. Bruce agreed that this procedure should continue.

Mr. Clarke said: "In connection with the subject matter of these things, I think the Commission should be interested in it. How is the subject selected? Who is the originator of the subjects of these reliefs?" Mr. Bruce replied: "Did you have the chance to read that last bulletin of ours? We just could not get anywhere on the matter of subject material for the Social Security Building. We published a letter I wrote as to what is considered the ideology of the murals." Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Bruce if the artist chooses the subject matter himself. Mr. Bruce replied that in that case he did. Mr. Clarke continued: "I don't want you to think that I am personally bringing this up, but the subject matter is so woven into the design that I wonder if, on these important buildings, through your being here, you could not bring the matter up and let us discuss it very briefly?" Mr. Bruce replied: "I had a long discussion about that the other night with the President, particularly in regard to the War Department. I don't want battle scenes; I hate bloody people lying around. There is no question in my mind that the quality of the work is improving. I don't want to be dictatorial as to the question of ideology. I have traveled in a great many of the places where these murals go. The people want something that reminds them of the country round about. What we are doing now is to ask the artist to travel to the town, visit the community and discuss the whole problem with the leading citizens. In a job of $1,500 or more we are developing the system of a local committee which conducts a competition for these and sends in a recommendation.

Mr. Clarke said: "In such an important building as the War Department, before the sculptural studies come before us, it might be well for us to discuss

with you, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Simon, what the subject matter is going to be because it certainly is going to have a very important effect. We will have to have a couple of Generals on the committee." Mr. Bruce said: "We had four Admirals in the case of the Santiago mural and we got into all sorts of trouble. The U. S. S. Brooklyn was not turned in the right direction. In the Battle of the Constitution, the whole painting had to be done over because a rope was in the wrong place."

Mr. Lamb said: "I think the choice of subject is the most difficult thing about all painting and sculpture." Mr. Manship agreed with him. Mr. Reynolds remarked that leaving the thing wide open to the artist may be the best. Mr. Manship thought the subject matter can be taken care of from the time that the artist has been selected by competition. Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Bruce: "Do you feel that the artist should in some detail initiate a work--outline in a general way a painting for the lobby of the War Department and then leave details to the artist?" Mr. Bruce replied that he did not know; that they had talked about that often and that they have 2,000 artists on their lists. He continued: "They all know this is the War Department Building. I am inclined to let the artist take a try at it." Mr. Lamb said: "When we were looking for the key of the New York World's Fair, we turned it over to Harrison and Fouilhoux to do without the slightest indication--we had nothing in mind--none of us could think of anything. They made hundreds of sketches but suddenly they got this inspiration of a huge globe. It took a spark of genius to make it. That same thing applies here." Mr. Bruce said: "I think it is the answer to this thing; it is their problem; let them think about it. Another thing on this question of subject matter is that we must be careful about technique. Out at Tucson, Arizona, we showed an engine on a mural, and we were told an engine like that wouldn't run."

Mr. Simon made the following statements in regard to subject matter: "In this question of subject matter it seems to me that one of the great ends of art is to give some inspiration to the people who look at these sculptures and paintings. Go into a post office; if the painter or sculptor has put something there that gives a lift to you for the day, he has accomplished something; if he has not, it is merely an exhibition of technical skill. Unless there is spirit behind it, the work loses in interest; looks so much like a mere display of technical skill that it has no interest for the public at large. Now when you consider that this mural and sculpture program governs art all over the country, there have been included among the artists those of every calibre, including some who do not have the element of greatness in their conception of what they are doing. It may be an interpretation of something that is just around the corner in their immediate surroundings, as a tobacco field. But unless the thing is interpreted with force it does not give you any inspiration. They used to pass over my desk by the hundreds. It does not seem that just because a man can paint and do some sculpture, it is necessarily true that he can do good work. It is not entirely a matter of self-expression. It is a matter that is very much bigger than that."

Mr. Clarke said: "It is a matter that must be done cooperatively. For example, I would assume that in the case of the War Department you would have to deal with a number of Generals before you get through."

Mr. Reynolds said: "I do not think that you necessarily have to do so, although they should be consulted."

The model for the eagle on the Social Security Building was then discussed. Mr. Clarke said: "This involves the whole design of the composition around the door and it was my understanding last time that all this had been submitted to

the Commission." Mr. Simon said that there is nothing left but this and the question is whether that is changed in its function much from the beginning. At present we think it has not changed its function much. It would seem to me the better part of wisdom to let this be deferred until after the building is erected. It was not considered advisable to lower the eagle since there are two flanking eagles at the bottom and a third eagle would be uninteresting.

The Commission concurred in the suggestion to decide on the inscription for the panel after the building is built. Mr. Simon felt strongly that that would be the best thing to do.

The sculpture for the War Department Building was then discussed. Mr. Manship referred to a conference with Mr. Foster at the Supervising Architects Office a few weeks ago. Mr. Manship at the time expressed his views on the subject in a letter to Mr. Clarke as follows:

> Mr. Foster was good enough to explain at length the proposed sculptural treatment for the War Department Building, and while construction plans are already far advanced, the decorative relationship of sculpture shows no especial collaboration of the artist with the architect, and, until that is sympathetically and intelligently done, we can hardly hope for more than commonplace results. The opportunities of sculptural adornment are infinite, and I am especially impressed by the lack of imagination or interest on the part of the architectural designers in this regard.
>
> I should like to recommend that studies be made for bronze entrance doors to the edifice. They would seem to me to offer an opportunity for a colorful treatment in a place where, at present, the design is without interest. And, further, that the proposed flagpole have its base of free sculptural design, for here, as well as on the doors, the bronze treatment and the subject matter appropriate to the War Department Building would give wonderful opportunities of embellishment and relieve the monotony of the plain architectural surfaces.

Mr. Clarke then asked Mr. Reynolds if there was not a possibility of embellishing the new War Department Building with something better than just

architectural bronze doors, better sculpture, flagpoles and so on. Mr. Manship called attention to the bronze doors in the Library of Congress Annex by Lee Lawrie. The Commission concurred with Mr. Manship that the bronze doors and bases for the flagpoles should be sculptural. Mr. Clarke then asked Mr. Bruce how far it will be possible to go with the decorations. Mr. Bruce replied: "The amount we have agreed on is as far as we can go." Mr. Reynolds said that there is a little leeway in regard to costs for that structure; he said further that the building does not lend itself to a lot of murals and if there is one large mural in the lobby, that will be quite satisfactory. The Commission also recommended that particular attention be given to this mural.

The procedure for securing suitable sculpture and mural paintings for public buildings was then discussed. Mr. Reynolds said, "I am in sympathy with the statement made by Mr. Manship that when a building has been designed in temporary stages, the architect probably has not given enough thought as to what might be done in sculpture. As I said before, the trend in architecture has changed rather rapidly and architects have not given much thought to sculpture on plain walls. The difficulty is that architects do not know how much sculpture they can get and they fear putting it in lest it might have to be taken out. It is a fear complex. That was the view of our committee."

Mr. Manship then said: "There have been many fine examples of collaboration of the architect and sculptor. Paul Cret here knows much about the appropriateness of sculpture as decoration. Take the Folger Library. He called in the sculptor with whom he knew he could work sympathetically and the result is, I think, magnificent. Now you cannot get that kind of achievement by designing a building without knowing in the first place just what the relationship of the sculpture to the architecture is to be. Architects fear that if there is a

competition for sculpture after the building is already designed, he will get an artist who has not necessarily had much experience and who will not know how to design and model in harmony with the architectural forms. The work should be more coordinated and there should be collaboration from the beginning. Lists could be made by the Section of Fine Arts, which is well equipped to recommend suitable persons, so that at the very inception of a public building a sculptor could be chosen to exchange suggestions with the architect and in that way work in the direction of harmonious relationship of the arts. It has been done successfully for centuries in this spirit."

Mr. Reynolds said: "The question which Mr. Manship raises is a fundamental one. Of course, we are committed to the selection of artists by competition and we are doing that in architectural work because of the great difficulty we have in making a direct selection. That has a history that goes back for years. Direct selection has been tried and then thrown out. If you are going to get a happy result in such a building as the War Department Building; if you are going to use sculpture to quite an extent, it should be so arranged that the sculptor could be selected through competition but be available when the building is in the design stage; then you would be able to achieve something. It is difficult for an architect to visualize all of his own sculpture work. In order to get a good building today we have to have collaboration of artist and engineer and that ought also to extend to the sculptor."

Mr. Clarke said: "I think it has been a mistake in running competitions to have the competition necessarily won to do a certain spot on a certain building. Can't the competitions be managed to choose a sculptor in the kind of work required and then have him work with the architect on the new problem without waiting for the building to be completed? Let him show that he is competent as

a sculptor to do something in the round or in the relief or any kind of problem." Mr. Lamb said: "Is it possible to have a competition which would select a panel of sculptors from which direct selection could be made? For instance, hold a competition for anything you please; it does not have to be concerned with the War Department, but select from five men, two or three for certain parts of that work. Then work with them from the beginning on the design. Why would it not be perfectly possible for two or three sculptors to come in and be appointed as an advisory board and ask the artists to collaborate with the advisory group. That advisory group would not necessarily be the men who would execute the work but would indicate the general treatment of the location as indicated. The same would apply to painters."

Mr. Clarke then asked the Commission: "How would it be proper, if that is the concensus of opinion, if we direct a letter to you, Mr. Reynolds, and suggest such a procedure that would effect that kind of collaboration. That is about all we can seek to do at this time." The Commission agreed to this and a letter was sent to Mr. Reynolds accordingly in connection with the letter concerning sculpture and painting for the War Department Building and sculpture for the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Board Building.

Reports were sent to Mr. Reynolds concerning the sculpture for the Social Security Building (C-1), sculpture for the War Department Building (C-2), the general subject of sculpture and paintings for public buildings (C-3) and copies of the reports were sent to Mr. Bruce (C-4).

6. SCOTT CIRCLE UNDERPASS: Captain Whitehurst submitted a sketch for an underpass on Thirteenth Street at Scott Circle. He said: "We made several sketches and at the last meeting of the Park and Planning Commission they approved this plan subject to approval of details by the National Park Service. While

they were making a study we made further study of the surface lay-out in an endeavor to increase the size of the reservations; this we accomplished. We submitted this to the Park and Planning Commission and the National Park Service submitted theirs and I don't think there is a hundred square feet of difference in any of the plans. Mr. Clarke asked what the Secretary of the Interior thought of this arrangement. Captain Whitehurst replied: "He was complaining about cutting up his parks; and he wanted to put into the act the proviso that the plans are to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior." Mr. Clarke remarked that the District Commissioners have the National Park Service, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, Secretary Ickes and Congress to satisfy and asked Captain Whitehurst if this could be done. Captain Whitehurst replied that they were in agreement as to the location as shown by this scheme. "The great trouble we are facing at all times is the need for advice and consultant service but it is difficult to have two approving authorities, especially when there may be some source of disagreement. We are seeking the advice and suggestions of the Fine Arts Commission just as in the case of Thomas Circle. One of the items we incorporated in Thomas Circle was suggested by this Commission. We are what might be called the subordinates of these three agencies and they are in substantial accord."

"This plan is a composite of several. The main difference is that Scott Circle has been changed to an oval and the islands have been slightly changed in size. Those on either end have been lengthened five feet, the same as on the minor axis. The Park Service office made these the same length on their drawings."

Captain Whitehurst then explained how he determined the way traffic would react to these circles, by placing patterns of the islands on the asphalt pave-

ment. He said: "They have just as much surface roadway capacity as before. Some shrubbery in the reservations is in the way but otherwise no trees would be touched. As to the trees on the map, all of them are noted, but if you analyze the situation, you find only half of the original trees in existence; and you may find some of them diseased and rotten." Mr. F. A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, remarked that one of the things they talked about at their recent meeting is whether this would save the important trees as there are some very fine Gingko trees there.

Mr. Clarke criticized the narrow openings to the streets and advised making all the throats wider because they will look narrower than they really are. Captain Whitehurst pointed out: "If you will notice, on this corner we have a pretty heavy projection; we have another over here. I believe there is some compromise so that they will not be offensive." Mr. Clarke expressed the feeling of the Commission in approving the general idea and letting the National Park Service and the Park and Planning Commission work it out.

Captain Whitehurst pointed out that the reservations would have nearly the same area as now. He said: "We are not artists enough to judge these things but I have always felt that the amount of area around the statue was out of all proportion to the size of the monument. Now the statue has a reservation area of 11,000 square feet; yet the new reservation will have 17,500 square feet. Certainly this is more area than the setting for the statue of Daniel Webster; we do get a better setting of the Scott Monument by increasing the area by 50 per cent; also the Hahnemann Statue on the east will have a good setting. The sidewalks will be taken off entirely from the oval around the Scott Circle.

7. MAINE AVENUE UNDERPASS (OLD WATER STREET): Captain Whitehurst presented a scheme for an underpass on Maine Avenue at Fourteenth Street. He said: "We

have been working on this for eight or nine months, that is, the National Park Service and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; we have had two different principal plans before us. At the last meeting of the Park and Planning Commission we had this plan and a plan prepared by the National Park Service. We sent them to the coordinating committee with the request to bring back a definite recommendation. The coordinating committee unanimously adopted the principles involved in this plan. This particular plan that you see before you was prepared in the Park and Planning office and involves three changes from the original, which the committee approved. The ramp has been changed, which necessitates removing the temporary Liberty Loan building. The original drawing was so made as to avoid this. There is no question that this is a decided improvement. The other change was a roadway for which we have used the underpass instead. There has been a rather lengthy study and we have had many, many schemes and we think we have ironed out many of the difficulties." Captain Whitehurst admitted that the favored plan did bring in a lot of streets but he felt there was no escape from that.

Captain Whitehurst continued: "I might say that the District Commissioners are worried about this situation; we now have an average of 36,000 vehicles every 24 hours through the 14th Street bridge. What is worrying the Commissioners is that with the opening of the Jefferson Memorial and the National Airport, the traffic is going to be greatly increased; we are really two or three years behind with this job. We will have to build a low level bridge to handle traffic while we build the main structure and leave as many connecting roadways as possible while building the underpass. We will remodel the railroad bridge. Any project of that character must extend over a long period of time. We are seeking ways and means of financing it. What the Commissioners are attempting

to do now is to get several authorities in agreement as to the general principles involved and from time to time details will come back to your Commission. The style of architecture, which is acceptable to us and which I assume will be to the Park and Planning Commission, is indicated on these sketches which have been made by Dr. Cret as preliminary studies." Mr. Delano said: "Captain Whitehurst had this before our meeting. This junction here was a very difficult one and I think he has improved it a little. In his first plan he wanted to preserve the Liberty Loan building. Mr. Partridge felt that since it was one of the main entrances to Washington that it should be as fine as possible."

Mr. Clarke then said: "May I offer this suggestion to the Commission for consideration and that is that we do not take any formal action with regard to the traffic but confine ourselves to architectural problems in connection with it. We can say that this is in the right direction. If I might add something from personal observation; in all places like this where you project the line of traffic, those points where streets intersect are very dangerous. I usually round them off. I would also make the entrance to the streets 27 feet instead of 24 feet in width. Captain Whitehurst replied: "We are going to study the plan further with the Park and Planning Commission. The Commissioners are very anxious to make some start. At Thomas Circle we laid the patterns on the pavement and let the cars run over them and we could see the traffic direction did not run parallel to the curb at all."

"We went just as far as we could with architecture and sculpture to make the scheme and we wanted to know whether our plan was sound or not." Mr. Delano said: "It might be well to get from the Fine Arts Commission whether they like a masonry wall or a slope". The Commission preferred the slope to the wall. The Commission Approved the scheme in principle and it was understood that Captain Whitehurst would submit plans from time to time during the development

of the project.

8. LOCATION FOR THE PAN AMERICAN ANNEX: Mr. F. A. DeLano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, conferred with the Commission of Fine Arts on the question of location of the Pan American Annex. He said: "Our committee has had two meetings and at the second meeting four of us more or less agreed that we might develop it in a certain way, but the District Commissioners would not agree. Also we had a scheme that the District Commissioners agreed to but the Secretary of the Interior did not agree to. There is no question that we can get a meeting of the minds of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission but to have a meeting of the minds of all five is a difficult task. There is great pressure being brought to bear by the State Department and by Dr. Rowe to have this Pan American Annex matter settled. In the first place, the Carnegie Foundation has signified their willingness to building the building and Congress approved the site right in front of this building. I am personally willing to leave it to your organization to work out a solution. Mr. Keppel saw me in New York about a week ago and he said that really something must be done. He said they cannot hold the money ($600,000) indefinitely. Dr. Rowe calls me up every few days and says really something must be done. Mr. Tellon has expressed great interest. I know the President has frequently said that we ought to settle it. So I wrote a letter to Secretary Ickes, saying that enormous pressure was being brought to bear on me and I wanted to know what was going to be done.

"There are two plans (Scheme M and Scheme F) which have been accepted by Secretary Ickes and this is one plan (Scheme M), of which I was not the author, but which was worked out in the Park and Planning Office. It has not been approved by the Park and Planning Commission as a whole. I think the District

people are going to say it is a great misfortune to obliterate thoroughfares with these intersections. At the present time there are on Constitution Avenue three intersections--one at 18th Street and another at 19th Street and Virginia Avenue. This other plan (Scheme F) changes that situation but whether it satisfies from a traffic standpoint is a question. One of the problems is that city water, electricity, gas and other public utilities are in this street and my stand is that we can still keep them in that street. That plan had been accepted by Secretary Ickes and by the District Commissioners but while this was being considered, your Chairman brought in a design like this and I said when I saw it that I would be willing to discard Scheme M and adopt his plan. I think there is a flowing line of traffic in his plan. I think it is an agreeable plan but as I understand it, Dr. Cret says that in the first place it would cost a good deal more than the original building; secondly, he does not like separating the buildings. (They would be connected by a basement.) But the vista through here is the thing that sold the plan to Secretary Ickes. I may say that this is one of the fifteen different plans that we have had. Dr. Cret has been most helpful. He approved this design (Scheme F) but this has never been accepted. Scheme M is preferable because there are fewer intersections."

Mr. Clarke said: "I understand the District Commissioners would not approve Scheme M because it closes 18th and 19th Streets." Mr. Clarke explained the problem to Mr. Holabird. He said that the faults of his scheme are that the two buildings would be a little more expensive and a little more costly to take care of. He said: "I think the Pan American Union would agree with that plan if their architect so advised them. What I cannot understand is how the District will be able to pay the expense of the streets for they do not want that burden."

It was pointed out by Mr. Delano that 19th Street is a one-way street and the car line would have to pass in front of the Interior Building; further that some one has to pay for the street changes, the estimated cost of which is something like $70,000.

Dr. Cret thought there should be no objection to closing Virginia Avenue between 18th and 19th Streets since there are so many other good views of the Washington Monument. Mr. Clarke explained that the difficulty in one regard is that the matter is talked over with only a representative from the D. C. Commissioners, who has to go back and get their views because he does not have the authority to talk for them. Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Delano that if the District Commissioners would let 18th Street be closed, whether his Commission would agree. Mr. Delano replied that he did not know whether he could get them all in line.

In general the Commission felt Mr. Clarke's scheme offered the simplest and best solution. The Commission finally decided to accept scheme B showing the Pan American Annex on the axis of the main building and on the axis of 18th Street. Mr. Clarke drew a sketch to illustrate this and a letter was sent to Mr. Delano, together with the sketch. (Exhibit D) A copy of letter with plan was sent to Secretary of the Interior Ickes, Dr. Rowe and to Major Tansey, representing the D. C. Commissioners.

9. APPOMATTOX COURT HOUSE GENERAL PLAN: Mr. Thomas Vint, Chief Architect of the National Park Service, presented a master plan for development of Appomattox Court House as a "Historical Monument". He said: "We have these general development plans for the Appomattox area; the Virginia State Highway goes through the tract and this is the old town, the courthouse set in the little

park." Mr. Vint had a larger scale map. Mr. Clarke asked if they had rebuilt the Treaty Tower. Mr. Vint replied that they had only as yet. He said: "When the Chicago World's Fair of 1893 was held, some man from Chicago took the old house down and placed the dismantled structure near the railroad station. Their money ran out, the house was left there and piece by piece it disappeared. It was a house that was built about the time of the Civil War. There is a man who had to do with its razing, who made some drawings and we are looking into the matter. We have an allotment for a development of this character; we also think we will get a CCC camp. No one lives in the old part of the town now. There are just two or three old brick buildings there and we will probably put them into shape and try to restore the original conditions. We would leave this road a dirt road as it was when Lee was there. Essentially, what we are going to do is to [illegible] people park outside and then walk through. We will try to bring back the picture as much as possible. Legislation required the restoration of the McLean House. There is a monument in the woods marking Grant's headquarters." Mr. Vint had a photograph of the McLean House, made by Brady, the negative of which is in the Library of Congress.

Mr. Clarke said that the War Department had a competition for the memorial back in 1931, but the Commission of Fine Arts had not recommended a monument but a restoration of the house, just to keep the character of the old place. Mr. Vint said there is really no design involved because they are trying to restore the original scene. Mr. Clarke thought that was fine and said: "I think we can approve the policy of restoring the old village." Thereupon the Commission approved the plan in principle and the National Park Service was informed accordingly. (Exhibit E)

10. [illegible] Mr. Kline submitted plans from the Capital Transit Company for a bus terminal and waiting room to be built at Ramsey Circle, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenues, S. E., near the new Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge. He said: "This required legislation in Congress to allow the Transit Company to build this facility on park property; it is subject to your approval. We started on studies. You approved this study in principle at a previous meeting; now we have been back to the Transit Company and they feel the facilities are a little greater than they should furnish and this is a re-study based on reducing the size of the comfort station. Their plan in part is based on this drawing here."

Mr. Clarke questioned whether it was necessary to have so large a window. Mr. Kline replied that the transit company's representative, who was present at the meeting, would like to have the window for purposes of control so the shelter is closed off entirely. Mr. Clarke said that the window could have a different shape and asked whether two windows could be used here instead of the large one. Mr. Lamb said that he did not like the window and suggested making it round. Mr. Kline emphasized the fact that it was needed for control.

It was felt that even though the Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge has granite abutments that does not necessarily mean this building should be of granite. Mr. Kline said they had thought that possibly a granite-textured brick would be desirable. Mr. Holabird said that he would go ahead and build it of brick--for it is on the other side of the Capitol--and it could be of red brick with white trim. Mr. Clarke said that Dr. Cret states that red brick is less conspicuous. Mr. Clarke asked if the roof would be of lead-coated copper and Mr. Kline replied in the affirmative. The Commission approved the suggestion to use common red brick of good quality with white trim, provided a sample will

be submitted and also detailed drawings. The sketch was considered to be in the right direction. (Exhibit F)

11. BUS AND STREET CAR TERMINAL AT ROSSLYN, VIRGINIA: Mr. Kline submitted plans from the Capital Transit Company of a bus terminal at Rosslyn, Virginia. He said: "It does not require legislation to erect this building because it is in the State of Virginia. Since there is a possibility of transfer from bus to rail, the Transit people would like to do something in the way of shelter but do not want to spend too much money because there are still buses that run directly into Washington. This is their submission of something they would like to do there although we made an improvement on that in our landscape work by spending an extra thousand dollars. Probably they will have to provide separate comfort stations for black and white at a later date. Mr. Lamb said that he would feel better if the columns shown in the design were a little heavier. Dr. Creel agreed with him. A low roof was recommended for the building. The Commission approved the scheme in principle, with the understanding that working drawings will be submitted in due time. (Exhibit G) Mr. Vint said the plaza had been developed to conform to plans of the National Park Service.

12. AIRPORT BRIDGE: Mr. Kline submitted architectural details for the North Access Overpass Bridge of the Washington National Airport. Mr. Clarke asked if the wing walls had been lengthened and was informed that this had been done. Mr. Kline asked about the color of paint. Mr. Clarke told him to use Dupont gray-green de luxe 25285, saying it had been used for steel bridge-work in New York and also for the Chain Bridge and Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge in Washington. Mr. Clarke suggested using undressed lumber forms, leaving the fins on so as to obtain horizontal lines. (Exhibit H)

13. GREAT FALLS, MARYLAND, LANDSCAPE PLAN: Mr. Kline submitted a landscape plan for the George Washington Memorial Parkway to Great Falls. Mr. Clarke said: "Let me ask one question. Why do the Park and Planning people have to put these two roads parallel to one another as if you were going through a city instead of through the country. It is very unpleasant to drive that way. It is a little more trouble to design the roads so that they are varied and greater distances apart, but it makes a much better road if you do not have to see traffic traveling in the opposite direction. The way this is planned is just as unimaginative as it can be." Mr. Kline replied that there has not been really room because the Park and Planning Commission buys only 100 feet on either side. In general the scheme was approved subject to the criticism by Mr. Clarke.

14. ZONING ALONG THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL: Mr. Kline asked whether the Commission of Fine Arts would approve placing the territory along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal from about New Hampshire Avenue and the parkway to Georgetown in the Shipstead-Luce Act area.

It was pointed out that the area is zoned industrial and that the International Machine Corporation wants to build adjacent to the canal; they might erect a better building if it required approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission felt the locality needed rezoning but suggested that Mr. Kline get the views of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in the matter.

15. GREAT ENTRANCE TO ARLINGTON CEMETERY: Mr. Delano said: "I am one of those who have no authority to speak but I object very much to that great pile of masonry of the exedra at the entrance to that very simple and beautiful building, the Lee Mansion. I was against the architectural gateway. The Park Service people said no planting could be done because the masonry flared out so much you could not put the plants in. Mr. Clarke said that the Commission

had requested the National Park Service to plant trees in front of the Great Entrance and that the request would be renewed to the Director of the Park Service and to the Secretary of the Interior also. This was agreed to.

16. DESIGN FOR FLAGPOLES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: Under date of May 13, a letter was received from Mr. Alfred Geiffert (Exhibit I) submitting a location plan for the proposed flagpoles to be erected on the Mall side of the National Gallery of Art and sketches for the bases of the flagpoles. The Commission interposed no objection to the locations. Mr. Manship, however, expressed a decided disapproval of sketches for the base of the flagpole, stating that it should be modeled by a sculptor and in view of the great amount of money spent on the National Gallery, the flagpoles ought to be in keeping with it. The Commission concurred in this, disapproving the sketches for the base of the flagpoles submitted and recommending that a sculptor be employed to model the base. (Exhibit I-1)

17. AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT WORLD WAR MEMORIAL TABLET: The secretary reported that the Department of Agriculture had asked for advice on how to stain the tablet since it is too white (it is of Carrara marble) in contrast with the yellow brick walls and how to make the lettering more legible.

The request was brought to the attention of Mr. Manship, who recommended in the matter of staining the tablet, the following:

White marble may be patined by various methods:

1. Creosote diluted in benzole is to be used in weak solution, and stains permanently a yellowish buff tone.
2. Oil with linseed oil.
3. Yellow wax diluted in turpentine.
4. Tobacco juice is a superficial coloring matter.
5. Tea stains superficially.

In regard to gilding the lettering, Mr. Manning said a gold leaf, 18-22 K of a dark tone would be appropriate. The representative of the Agriculture Department War Memorial Committee was informed of this accordingly.

18. ALBERT GALLATIN STATUE: The secretary reported the receipt of a copy of a letter from Emanuel Celler in regard to a letter from Mr. James E. Fraser, sent to the Congressman setting forth the status of the Albert Gallatin Statue, as follows:

May 1, 1940.

Honorable Emanuel Celler,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Celler:

Possibly you are aware of the length of time it took before permission was given me to go forward with the Gallatin statue. Meanwhile I necessarily accepted other commissions which were contracted for, and these contracts have had to be fulfilled. They have taken much of my time and delayed my work on the Gallatin model.

Nevertheless, I have gone forward with the work, and I am now ready to say that the working model is finished, but I cannot at this time tell you when the full size statue will be complete and ready for unveiling.

I am giving my every effort toward its completion and I will keep you informed of its progress. I expect to be in Washington soon and will bring you some photographs of the model.

Thank you for your note, and your interest in the statue of this great man.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) James Fraser.

The secretary reported that the pedestal for the statue is in place on the north side of the Treasury Department Building.

19. CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 9602 TO CREATE A U. S. BOARD OF AWARDS AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE PRESENTATION OF CERTAIN MEDALS: Hon. Kent E. Keller, Chairman of the House Committee on the Library, having requested a report from

the Commission of Fine Arts on H. R. 9602 to create a United States Board of Awards and to provide for the presentation of certain medals, a copy of the bill was sent to each member of the Commission for preliminary report. (Exhibit J) Dr. Cret reported in detail by letter (Exhibit J-1).

Mr. Manship interposed no objection to the bill. Mr. Holabird reported as follows:

May 13, 1940.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

In answer to your letter of May 10 referring to H. R. 9602, my first reaction is against such a bill.

It seems to me that we have gone along pretty well without any such specific award for outstanding service. Even those in the Army and Navy, which I think have been well handled, are the cause of hard-feeling and grief with always in the background the hint of influence.

A discussion might convince me of the merit of the bill but all I can give you is my first reaction.

Yours truly,
(Signed) John A. Holabird

Mr. Bruce said that he was of the opinion that since only six medals are to be given each year he thought the matter could be attended to by the Commission of Fine Arts without creating another commission. Mr. Clarke felt the Commission could do little in this matter at the present time since the bill was pending for action by Congress.

The secretary said that the Committee on the Library would meet on Saturday, May 18, and Chairman Clarke said he would arrange to attend the hearing.

20. LOCATION FOR MARCONI MEMORIAL: The secretary presented the following letter received from the Marconi Memorial Association, dated April 24, 1940, in which they agreed to accept the location approved by the Commission of Fine Arts at 16th and Lamont Streets, as follows:

April 24th, 1940.

Gentlemen:

We are pleased to advise you that upon the examination of the sites submitted to us on April 6, 1940 by the members of the Board of Trustees, we have approved the location known as 309 (a) at 16th & La Mont Streets and I have been instructed by the Board to communicate this decision to you.

I have also this day communicated with the National Park Service concerning this matter.

Thanking you for your kind courtesies, I am

Very truly yours,
(Signed) S. Samuel Di Falco

Mr. Kline submitted a landscape plan from the Marconi Memorial Association for the site selected for the Marconi Memorial at 16th and Lamont Streets. He said: "They have settled on that if the site and planting are approved by you. As you know they are disinclined to spend any more money than they have to. We suggested that they hire a landscape architect and they have obtained a nurseryman." Mr. Kline felt the main point the Commission would be interested in is the orientation of the statue. He pointed out the building line of 16th Street and remarked that in order to go on the other side of that line they will probably have to get special permission. Mr. Kline also submitted a sketch for a landscape plan made by the National Park Service.

Mr. Manship said: "As I remember it, it was the south axis that we preferred; we decided that the way to look at it was with the plot bisected. I think that it would not look quite so skew as shown in the plan of the Marconi people. Mr. Clarke remarked that he thought it rather unfortunate for different organizations or patriotic groups to come down to Washington to put up a monument without spending any more money than they have to. He added: "We can approve this and say that the National Park Service scheme is the minimum we can get

about with and if they do not have sufficient funds, they will have to obtain same." Mr. Kline added that according to the legislation [illegible] everything necessary to give the memorial a good setting, such as planting, walks, benches, etc. It was understood that the National Park Service would take up the matter with the Marconi Memorial Association with a view to adjusting this matter and securing an adequate landscape plan. Also the Commission recommended that the Marconi Memorial Association secure a competent landscape architect.

21. LUNCH ROOM, NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE AND 27TH STREET: The secretary submitted a rendering for a lunch room to be built within the Shipstead-Luce Act area at the point of New Hampshire Avenue and 27th Street by the Blue Bell System, Inc. The design indicated a plain triangular limestone building about 30 feet long and 20 feet high. The architect members of the Commission interposed no objection to the design, but it was understood that a complete set of architectural drawings would have to be submitted before construction work is begun.

22. THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Chairman called attention to the fact that this meeting to a day marked the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the Commission of Fine Arts by Congress, May 17, 1910. The Chairman said that the Commission has had a long history of notable achievements. During the 30 years, 43 artists have served as members of the Commission and 281 official meetings have been held. A public statement was prepared, which was given to the press (Exhibit Y, and a telegram of congratulations was sent to Mr. Moore. (Exhibit Y-1,

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p. m. During the afternoon the Commission made a trip of inspection to the Washington National Airport.

Washington Star — April 25, 1940

Paul P. Cret

The appointment of Paul P. Cret to be a member of the Commission of Fine Arts was indicated because of the distinction of his work in Washington. But it also happens that he enjoys a national reputation as an architect of the very highest genius. His contemporaries in his chosen field of labor have acknowledged his leadership again and again, most notably, perhaps, in the award of the gold medal of the American Institute.

Mr. Cret, however, has not sought celebrity, and such recognition as he has had cannot be regarded as an acknowledgment of his own achievement exclusively. He was born at Lyons, in France, October 23, 1876, an heir to a great classic tradition, and he has been faithful to it throughout his career. His training was formal as well as profound. The "glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome" are principles with him. He obeys them, not slavishly, but with a joyful comprehension of their essential worth.

The Folger Shakespeare Library probably is Mr. Cret's most memorable triumph. Neither antique nor a denial of ancient standards, it fits gracefully into the scene to which it is assigned. Its power is manifest in the influence it already has exerted upon the Library of Congress Annex, even upon the Supreme Court Building. The Federal Reserve Board Building, as might be expected, is almost a companion piece. But both designs are original. Their creator is an interpreter, not a copyist.

Of course, there are critics who sincerely would like to experiment with the development of the Nation's Capital. The sketch for the proposed Smithsonian Gallery of Art is frankly radical, conspicuously defiant of the existing patterns of Washington. If executed, it doubtless would set a fashion for further adventures in a futuristic direction. But Mr. Cret is too philosophic to approve wholeheartedly of contradictions. His presence in the Fine Arts Commission is a guarantee of logic and rationalism for which the public will be grateful.

COPY

May 17, 1940.

Dear Mrs. Ross:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today considered the model which you submitted with your letter of May 16, 1940, for the Greenwich, Connecticut, Memorial Medal.

The Commission advise that the model lacks distinguished medallic character. It is pictorial rather than sculptural. The pattern is insufficient for the space and the linear composition is dry and sterile. The scale is too fine and elaborate for reduction.

The model is herewith returned.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Nellie Tayloe Ross,
Director of the Mint,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

May 17, 1940.

Dear Senator Barkley:

With reference to the proposed portrait of former President Herbert Hoover for the White House, I enclose herewith a list of five distinguished American portrait painters suggested by Mr. Eugene Savage, painter, a member of the Commission of Fine Arts. The Commission unanimously concurs in the list of names submitted since each one of these gentlemen is eminently qualified, by both training and experience, to do full justice to the subject.

In accordance with your letter to me, dated March 8, 1940, that Mr. Hoover be consulted, I assume that you will submit this list to Mr. Hoover for his consideration.

If the Commission can be of further assistance to you, or if we might aid Mr. Hoover in this matter, we stand ready to render service at your pleasure.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Alben W. Barkley, Chairman,
Joint Committee on the Library,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

Wayman Adams, National Academician, Elizabethtown, New York.

Studied. Indianapolis; Italy; Spain.

Awards. Thomas Proctor Prize, National Academy
Frank G. Logan Medal, Chicago
First Altman, National Academy
Portrait Prize, Springfield Art Association
Osborn Prize
Works in various galleries and institutions.

Louis Betts, National Academician, 119 East 19th Street, New York.

Studied. Philadelphia Academy, Paris, London.

Awards. First Altman Prize, National Academy
Gold Medal, Allied Artists Exhibition
Saltus Medal, National Academy
Well represented in museums and galleries

Charles Hopkinson, National Academician, Fenway Studios, Boston, Mass.

Studied. New York and Paris.

Recommended by Commission of Fine Arts to paint war celebrities, 1919.
Portraits now in galleries and educational institutions throughout the country.

Ernest Ipsen, National Academician, Village House, Dartmouth, Mass.

Awards. Lippencott Prize,
Penn. Academy of Fine Arts
Proctor and Maynard Prizes
National Academy, New York
Portraits in many galleries and educational institutions throughout the country.

John C. Johansen, National Academician, 12 West 9th Street, New York.

Studied. Art Institute, Chicago; Academy Julian, Paris.

Awards. Saltus Gold Medal, National Academy, New York.
Norman Wait Harris Medal, American Biennial, Chicago
Gold Medal, San Francisco Exposition
Gold Medal, Penn. Academy of Fine Arts
Honorable Mention, Carnegie International
Large number of portraits and paintings in museums, galleries and other institutions
Chosen to paint war celebrities in 1919

COPY

April 30th, 1940.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
101 Park Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Gilmore,

The following is a report of my visit to Washington, April 26th and 27th, relative to sculpture for the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Board Buildings, as well as the Building of the War Department.

It has been difficult to understand the appropriateness and treatment of the sculptured panels for the Social Security Building, as presented by the Section of Fine Arts to our Commission, without showing their relationship to the architecture on which they are to be placed.

I visited Mr. Simon's office and saw the drawings for the Building and the scale model of the facade. Upon inquiry as to whether the sculptors had seen the scale model, I was advised that they probably had not; and, upon my asking the same question at the Section of Fine Arts, I was also informed that they probably had not seen the model. This lack of cooperation between the two Departments helps to explain the possible lack of appropriateness of the models to the place for which they are destined, and it renders helpful criticism and approval by our Commission difficult.

I am personally of the opinion that more interesting solutions could be found than those presented by the models submitted.

Mr. Foster was good enough to explain at length the proposed sculptural treatment for the War Department Building, and, while construction plans are already far advanced, the decorative relationship of sculpture shows no especial collaboration of the artist with the architect, and, until that is sympathetically and intelligently done, we can hardly hope for more than commonplace results. The opportunities of sculptural adornment are infinite, and I am especially impressed by the lack of imagination or interest on the part of the architectural designers in this regard.

I should like to recommend that studies be made for bronze entrance doors to the edifice. They would seem to me to offer an opportunity for a colorful treatment in a place where, at present, the design is without interest. And, further, that the proposed flagpole have its base of free sculptural design, for here, as well as on the doors, the

EXHIBIT C

bronze treatment and the subject matter appropriate to the War Department Building would give wonderful opportunities of embellishment and relieve the monotony of the plain architectural surface.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Paul Manship.

(Copy to Mr. Gaertner)

C O P Y

May 29, 1940.

My dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17th, 1940, gave very careful consideration to the photographs of models for the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Board Building that were submitted by Mr. Bruce, Chief of the Section of Fine Arts, of your office.

The Commission approved the models by Robert Kittredge and Emma Lou Davis. It is understood that it is proposed to carve this sculpture in red granite. The Commission recommend, therefore, that when the time comes to do this the exposed surface of the stone slab be either polished or honed and that the figures be incised, the carved surfaces being left unfinished after cutting so as to offer a contrast in color with the smooth finish of the slabs.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
Federal Works Agency
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-1

C O P Y

May 29, 1940.

My dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May seventeenth, gave further consideration to the question of sculpture for the new War Department Building. Mr. Manship prepared a statement in regard to the subject which I submit for your considered judgment:

> "Mr. Foster was good enough to explain at length the proposed sculptural treatment for the War Department Building, and, while construction plans are already far advanced, the decorative relationship of sculpture shows no especial collaboration of the artist with the architect, and, until that is sympathetically and intelligently done, we can hardly hope for more than commonplace results. The opportunities of sculptural adornment are infinite, and I am especially impressed by the lack of imagination or interest on the part of the architectural designers in this regard.
>
> "I should like to recommend that studies be made for bronze entrance doors to the edifice. They would seem to me to offer an opportunity for a colorful treatment in a place where, at present, the design is without interest. And, further, that the proposed flagpole have its base of free sculptural design, for here, as well as on the doors, the bronze treatment and the subject matter appropriate to the War Department Building would give wonderful opportunities of embellishment and relieve the monotony of the plain architectural surfaces."

The Commission concur in these suggestions of Mr. Manship and are hopeful that sculptors may be appointed to model the bronze doors and the flagpole bases for this building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public
Buildings
Federal Works Agency
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-2

C O P Y

May 29, 1940.

My dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17th, 1940, gave careful consideration to the question of the embellishment of public buildings with sculpture and mural paintings, with particular reference to those erected under your supervision in the District of Columbia. It was a pleasure to have had Mr. Simon and you with us to discuss means whereby closer collaboration between architect, painter, and sculptor may be made more effective.

In recent years, architects of many of our public buildings in Washington have not collaborated with the sculptor and mural painter to the extent desirable to produce the best results. Recent experiences of the Commission of Fine Arts in connection with models for sculpture and with designs for mural paintings in the new Interior Department Building have indicated an almost complete absence of cooperation between the representatives of the three arts. As additional evidence of the lack of understanding of artistic collaboration, I cite more recent examples, namely in the case of the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Board Buildings.

The Commission of Fine Arts are not disposed to dictate methods whereby the early association of artists may be effected, since that is an administrative problem which may be best worked out after trial.

The Commission are hopeful that preliminary designs for both painting and sculpture in the form of sketches and models may, as in the past, continue to be submitted for consideration as to subject matter as well as for artistic quality. Thus we shall have the opportunity to offer advice in the early stages of the development of the work.

The letter which the Commission of Fine Arts addressed to the Members of Congress on April 20th, 1940 upon the subject of the embellishment of public buildings has met with most favorable response. A copy of that letter is attached hereto. It is hoped, in the future, that this subject may receive consideration by Committees of Congress in connection with applications for approval of legislation and appropriations for public buildings. It is, of course, important that allotments made for sculpture and painting be definitely allocated from the beginning and be not diverted to other uses during construction.

The Commission of Fine Arts are highly appreciative of your generous cooperation in the past and offer to assist you whenever called upon to effect more desirable artistic results in the public building program.

For the Commission of Fine Arts;

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman.

Hon. W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
Federal Works Agency
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-3

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

GILMORE D. CLARKE, Chairman
EUGENE F. SAVAGE — WILLIAM F. LAMB
CHARLES L. BORIE, Jr. — PAUL MANSHIP
HENRY R. SHEPLEY — EDWARD BRUCE
H. P. CAEMMERER, Secretary

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

April 20, 1940.

To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Gentlemen:

During the past several years the Commission of Fine Arts have supported a movement, inaugurated by this Administration, to embellish public buildings in the District of Columbia and in the several States of the Union. This movement has conclusively demonstrated that we have in the United States artists---architects, painters, and sculptors---who have rendered most distinguished service in the professions of the arts.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully wish to emphasize the importance of maintaining the highest standards in respect to both design and execution of buildings erected by the Federal Government, for, in quality of excellence, the examples established in the art and architecture of governmental structures exert a potent national influence.

A serious handicap in the current movement to embellish public buildings has been the rather meagre allotment of funds for sculpture and mural paintings. On many Federal Post Office Buildings but one per cent of the total building cost has been allocated for the purposes of decoration. This sum seems much too small in consideration of the great influence which the work of competent painters and sculptors has upon the lives of people in all parts of the United States. In Italy, for example, five per cent of the total cost of governmental buildings is the normal allowance for works of art developed collaboratively.

In the case of public buildings constructed in the National Capital since 1927, the percentages of the cost of sculpture and mural decoration, in relation to the total cost, were as follows:

Building for the Department of Justice	3.5%
Building for the Archives	3.1%
Building for the Post Office Department	3.0%
Building for the Department of Commerce	1.2%
Building for the Department of the Interior	1.0%
Building for the Federal Trade Commission	1.7%
The United States Supreme Court	3.0%

In many instances the allocations of funds for sculpture and mural painting have been in the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts, woefully inadequate. It is the considered judgment of this Commission that appropriations for decoration should never be less than three per cent of the cost of the building; often these appropriations might be increased to provide an allowance of from more than three to five per cent of the cost of a given structure. In any case the percentage should be sufficient to meet the cost of decoration as may be determined by the governmental agencies in immediate charge of the design of each project in conference with the architect of each building. The needs for embellishment of public buildings, in consideration of the particular character or type of structure should be, we believe, fixed and not sacrificed later for unforeseen expenditures in other directions as has frequently obtained in the past.

It is unnecessary to remind the members of the Congrees of the important place the Fine Arts have in the history of the great nations of the world. The record of national achievement is largely told in sculpture and mural painting; we usually think of the nations of the past in terms of their principal heritage, the Fine Arts. "Art confers immortality. A noble, artistic representation immortalizes the cause symbolized, the thought embodied, the individual portrayed".

The decoration of our public buildings has an important bearing upon the future of art in this country. Linked with our artistic development are questions of patriotism and culture. This Nation, while young, has nevertheless a notable record of outstanding achievement and noble and inspiring historic events which deserve to be portrayed for posterity in great and important works of art.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully present this problem to the Members of the Congress, with the earnest hope that the Art of the United States may be encouraged to grow and to find expression in association with buildings, great and small, erected by authority of the Congress in Washington and in the States of the Union.

Respectfully submitted for the Commission of Fine Arts:

GILMORE D. CLARKE,

Chairman.

COPY

May 29, 1940.

My dear Mr. Bruce:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Reynolds, approving models for sculpture by Robert Kittredge and Emma Lou Davis, photographs of which you submitted at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on May 17th.

In addition, I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Reynolds on the subject of sculpture and mural painting for the War Department Building; also one on the general subject of sculpture and mural paintings for public buildings. These letters embody suggestions made at the recent meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts. We are glad to know that you concur in them and we hope that the plan of procedure indicated in the matter of cooperation between the Section of Fine Arts, the Supervising Architect's Office, and the Commission of Fine Arts, will be followed in designing future public buildings.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Edward Bruce, Chief,
Section of Fine Arts,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

CARTER GLASS, VA., CHAIRMAN
KENNETH MCKELLAR, TENN.
CARL HAYDEN, ARIZ.
ELMER THOMAS, OKLA.
JAMES F. BYRNES, S. C.
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, MD.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL, GA.
ALVA B. ADAMS, COLO.
PATRICK MC CARRAN, NEV.
JOHN H. OVERTON, LA.
JOHN H. BANKHEAD, ALA.
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, WYO.
HARRY S. TRUMAN, MO.
EDWARD R. BURKE, NEBR.
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, R. I.
FRANCIS T. MALONEY, CONN.
DENNIS CHAVEZ, N. MEX.
FREDERICK HALE, MAINE
GERALD P. NYE, N. DAK.
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, JR., DEL.
STYLES BRIDGES, N. H.
HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., MASS.
RUFUS C. HOLMAN, OREG.
ROBERT A. TAFT, OHIO
EVERARD H. SMITH, CLERK
JOHN W. R. SMITH, ASST. CLERK

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

May 3, 1940

Major Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman
Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

My dear Major Clarke:

I transmitted to the Commissioner of Public Buildings your letter of April 30, and I am enclosing herewith a response in which I believe you will be interested.

In case a general public buildings program is authorized this year by the Congress, which I consider to be extremely doubtful, I shall be very glad to bear your suggestion in mind and to present it to the other members of the Appropriations Committee.

With cordial good wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

Clare Hayden

U. S. S.

ENCLOSURE #15908 SECTION OF FINE ARTS

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

IN REPLYING, QUOTE THE ABOVE SUBJECT, BUILDING, AND THESE LETTERS SA:ADM

May 1, 1940.

My dear Senator:

Acknowledgment is made of your letter of April 23, transmitting a copy of a letter of April 20, signed by Major Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman of The Commission of Fine Arts.

Referring to buildings constructed under the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings Administration, the suggestion contained in Major Clarke's letter is that the funds designated for mural painting and sculpture be increased from the one per cent as now generally used, to three per cent.

The funds available as now set up from estimates submitted for the construction of Federal Buildings under the control of this office would in many cases not be sufficient to permit the expenditure of so great an amount as three per cent for painting and sculpture and still retain sufficient funds to furnish the space required in the fulfillment of the actual practical purpose of the building. It would therefore be necessary to make a general increase in the amount of the estimates in order to meet the suggestion that three per cent be allotted to mural paintings and sculpture. Should the Congress approve that procedure this office would govern itself accordingly.

As related to the larger buildings, the three per cent proposed would result in an expenditure which might be regarded as a larger amount than would be warranted for murals and sculpture for Federal buildings. For instance for a project for which $10,000,000 is allotted, cost of murals or sculpture would be $300,000. From that point of view the Congress might wish to consider the use of a sliding scale for murals and sculpture in buildings constructed under the control of this office, by which projects with allotments of $5,000,000 or less would have three per cent of the limit of cost (less administrative expenses) set aside for murals and sculpture; and for projects in excess of $5,000,000, the three per cent might be reduced progressively by a sliding scale downward to such figures as might be determined.

Should you desire further or more detailed information this office would be pleased to furnish it upon a request from you.

There is returned enclosed, Major Clarke's letter, mentioned above.

Very truly yours,

W E Reynolds

Commissioner of Public Buildings.

Hon. Carl Hayden,
United States Senate.

C O P Y

May 18, 1940.

My dear Mr. Delano:

I attach herewith a photostat of Plan Study M, showing a rearrangement of streets in connection with the location of the proposed Pan American Annex building. This study was discussed at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts yesterday when you were present and we all agreed, including Mr. Cret, that the Annex may be located on the axis of the Pan American building as well as on the axis of Eighteenth Street, more or less as I have indicated in pencil on the photostat. It is understood, of course, that the size and shape of the building will have to be modified to fit this site.

I think the members of the Commission of Fine Arts preferred the scheme which I suggested, in which both the Secretary of the Interior and yourself concurred in when we last met in the Secretary's office. A print of that scheme was sent to you on April 18th. It has the advantage of keeping Eighteenth and Nineteenth Streets open and in the opinion of this Commission would provide a very much more satisfactory arrangement for traffic. In discussing this with Mr. Cret, I think he feels that the scheme would work out satisfactorily from an architectural standpoint.

I would think, therefore, that the Fine Arts Commission prefers the scheme showing the Pan American Annex on the axis of the new Interior Department Building, providing a structure in two parts connected by a terrace, closing Virginia Avenue but leaving Eighteenth and Nineteenth Streets open. The Commission of Fine Arts, however, would be willing to approve the scheme to locate the Pan American Annex on the axis of Eighteenth Street and the axis of the Pan American building, as shown on the photostat marked Study M, which is attached.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Frederic A. Delano, Chairman,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

May 31, 1940.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17, 1940, approved in principle a landscape plan submitted by Mr. Thomas C. Vint, Chief Architect of your office, for the development of Appomattox Court House, Virginia.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

C O P Y

May 18, 1940.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17, 1940, gave preliminary approval to a revised design submitted by Mr. Donald L. Kline, Acting Chief, Planning and Construction Division, of your office, in behalf of the Capital Transit Company, for Service Building at Barney Circle, near Pennsylvania Avenue and Seventeenth Street, Southeast, with the understanding that final architectural drawings will be submitted to the Commission, incorporating a few changes that were suggested; in particular, a flat roof is to be preferred to a gabled roof at that location. Also, the Commission recommend the use of a good grade of salmon colored red brick, with white stone trim, and would like to see a sample of the brick.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

May 18, 1940.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17, 1940, gave preliminary approval to a design submitted by Mr. Donald L. Kline, Acting Chief, Planning and Construction Division, of your office, in behalf of the Capital Transit Company, for a building on the Plaza at Rosslyn, Virginia, with the understanding that architectural drawings in detail will be submitted to the Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

C O P Y

May 18, 1940.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17, 1940, considered the final architectural details for the North Access Underpass of the Washington National Airport. The Commission approved them, with the suggestion that the finish of the concrete used on the structure be not bush hammered, but rather that the horizontal form markings remain.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C O P Y

May 13, 1940.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
National Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Enclosed is one blue print of our drawing No. M12-2 the planting plan for the Constitution Avenue entrance to the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C.; and two prints each of SK-719 and SK-737 prepared by the office of John Russell Pope, O. R. Eggers and D. P. Higgins, Associates.

The Architects have requested that we send these two sketches showing the design of the proposed flag poles together with sheet 2 of our planting plan which shows their location in relation to the building.

We have discussed this matter with Mr. Clarke and he believes that the Commission should review the sketches since they represent a change from the fountains which were a part of the architectural drawings previously submitted to and approved by the Commission.

We would appreciate your placing this matter on the agenda of the next Commission meeting which we understand is to be held on Friday, May 17th.

Sincerely yours,
ALFRED GEIFFERT, JR.
By Malcolm Kirkpatrick

MK:LH
Enclosures

EXHIBIT I

C O P Y

May 18, 1940.

Dear Mr. Geiffert:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on May 17, 1940, considered the sketches and location plan for flagpoles for the National Gallery of Art, submitted with your letter of May 13th.

There appeared to be no objection to placing the flagpoles at the locations indicated in the plan. However, the Commission disapproved the design for the flagpoles.

The Commission respectfully suggest that a sculptor be employed to design bronze bases for these flagpoles, so as to make them interesting and appropriate for the building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Alfred Geiffert, Jr.,
101 Park Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT I-1

76TH CONGRESS
3D SESSION

H. R. 9602

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 30, 1940

Mr. GROSS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Library

A BILL

To create a United States Board of Awards and to provide for the presentation of certain medals.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created the United States Board of Awards (hereinafter referred to as the Board), which shall be composed of seven members, as follows: The chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate; the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; the Librarian of Congress; the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts; and two persons, neither of whom shall be an officer or employee of the United States, to be appointed

EXHIBIT J

by the President of the United States, each for a term of four years. Any vacancy occurring in the appointive membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment, but any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such predecessor. The Board shall select a chairman from among its members. Four members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. No vacancy in the Board shall impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the functions of the Board. The members of the Board shall receive no compensation for services as members thereof. The offices of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Board may, in its discretion, meet elsewhere in the continental United States in order to carry out its functions under this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Board to submit to the President during each calendar year the names of not more than six persons whom the Board has found, after careful consideration of all the facts and circumstances with respect to each case, to merit the award of the medal authorized by this Act. Each such person shall be chosen by the Board because of some outstanding achievement for which Federal recognition in the form of a medal or other

award is not authorized by existing law. Such outstanding achievement may be rendered in any field of human endeavor, including contributions to the advancement of scientific knowledge, the application of the truths of science in a practical way for the welfare of the human race, creative works of distinction, conspicuous service to humanity at the voluntary risk of life or health over and above the ordinary risks of duty, and any exhibition of extraordinary heroism.

(b) The President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, to each person whose name is submitted to him by the Board the medal provided by this Act, together with a rosette, or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, a ribbon to be worn with the medal, and an appropriate certificate of merit. The award authorized by this Act may be granted posthumously, and may be presented to such representative of the deceased as the President may designate.

SEC. 3. The Board is authorized and directed to procure the medals and accompanying insignia authorized to be awarded by this Act. Each such medal and accompanying insignia shall be of such material and design, and shall be inscribed, as the Board may determine. It shall also be the duty of the Board to prepare the certificates of merit.

SEC. 4. (a) Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Board is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the

compensation of a secretary and such other employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions.

(b) The Board may make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for office supplies, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the Board. All expenditures of the Board, including necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by the members of the Board while engaged upon the business of the Board, or incurred by the employees of the Board while absent from their designated posts of duty upon any business of the Board, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the Board.

(c) The Board shall make an annual report to Congress, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated annually not exceeding the sum of $10,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act.

76TH CONGRESS
3D SESSION

H. R. 9602

A BILL

To create a United States Board of Awards and to provide for the presentation of certain medals.

By Mr. GROSS

APRIL 30, 1940
Referred to the Committee on the Library

C O P Y

May 13, 1940.

H. P. Caemmerer, Esq., Secretary
Fine Arts Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

As I understand it, the purpose of the report to be presented to the Committee on the Library, House of Representatives about HR-9602, is not to comment on the principle of the proposed Bill. The report (No. 952) of the Honorable Keller, Chairman of Committee on the Library on a similar Bill, states--"The judgment of the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts was especially sought in this connection (the annual appropriation needed...)" I assume therefore that fundamentals were considered by the Commission at the time (1937). Mr. Keller adds--"The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts should prove an invaluable member because of the very important service he can render in the designing and preparation of the medals, and the tangible evidence of recognition involved."

One might add that the Commission of Fine Arts Chairman's knowledge of notable achievements in the field of the Fine Arts will make his services valuable beyond this preliminary stage of securing the medals or emblems to be awarded, and that he will be a most competent adviser of the Board of Awards when "creative work of distinction" is involved.

It seems, therefore, that it is on Sec. 3 of the Bill that suggestions are desired, that is, on the medals, diplomas and emblems to be procured by the Board of Awards:

1. Medals - The fact that the recipients may have rendered service "in any field of human endeavor", requires the subject matter to be symbolic of recognition by the Nation in a very general way and without reference to any special activity. To secure one or several models of the medal, a sculptor who has given proof of his ability as a Medalist could be recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts. The commission of modeling this medal is hardly of sufficient importance to warrant an open competition. A limited competition might be advisable if direct selection is objected to. The fact that the Bill mentions "a ribbon to be worn with the medal" implies that the author of the Bill has in mind a medal of the type of Army medals. Because of the high standing contemplated for these awards, it might be contemplated wearing the medal with a ribbon in the form of a collar, such as is the case for several foreign decorations. However, some people might object to this.

2. Insignia. - Personally, I prefer a narrow ribbon or a rosette, to a low-relief metal insignia. The enamel small bar used with some

service decorations might also be considered. In this case, the Commission might suggest colors and shape when the time comes. The Certificate of Merit, or diploma, is a matter of good design for the type of letters and setting, for which an expert might well be employed.

3. Cost of Procuring Models-- Out of the 1st appropriation, a sufficient sum to secure models of the medal, insignia and diploma, will have to be set aside. I believe that $2,500 might cover this cost.

4. The cost of the medals themselves is a yearly item, not necessarily large if my assumption of size is correct. It varies with the nature of metal used--gold, silver or bronze--and the technique selected which might include enamel or even precious stones, as in a number of foreign decorations. It might be found advisable to depart, in this case, from the all-metal types used for military awards.

These questions cannot be discussed usefully until Congress has acted on the Bill, and the President appointed its personnel.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Paul P. Cret.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

A meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on May 17, 1940, marked to a day, the thirtieth anniversary of the establishment of the Commission by Congress. During the three decades of its existence 43 leading artists of the country have served without compensation as Commissioners, representing the professions of architecture, landscape architecture, painting, and sculpture. The existence of this permanent Commission of distinguished artists has enabled the Government to secure continuous expert advice in matters pertaining to the Fine Arts. Appointment to membership has ever been regarded a patriotic service to the Nation, "well qualified judges of the fine arts" being requisite for appointment made by the President for four year overlapping terms.

Prior to the establishment of the Commission of Fine Arts in 1910, it was the practice of Congress to authorize the appointment of a special committee to advise concerning each specific project. When the project was completed the committee was discharged, leaving Congress and heads of governmental departments without a recognized body to which matters pertaining to the Fine Arts might be referred.

During the fiscal year 1911, the first in the life of the Commission of Fine Arts, there were 41 submissions; now they number several hundred each year. There is hardly any other appropriation made by Congress which brings such a large proportionate return as that for

the Commission of Fine Arts, since a statutory limitation of only $10,000 a year has been made during the thirty years of the life of this body.

The first matter which came before the Commission of Fine Arts concerned the design and location of the Lincoln Memorial. During the succeeding years the Commission advised concerning many other buildings, monuments and memorials but none have exceeded in importance that of the Memorial to Abraham Lincoln.

The Act creating the Commission of Fine Arts specifically states that the "provisions of this Act shall not apply to the Capitol building of the United States and the Library of Congress". However, the Committees on the Library of the Senate and of the House of Representatives frequently avail themselves of the services of the Commission of Fine Arts in matters pertaining to the Capitol area.

The Commission of Fine Arts is an advisory body and does not have the power of veto. In spite of this fact its decisions are seldom overruled. Occasionally Congress confers the veto power upon the Commission by requiring, in specific legislation, that a design shall have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

At the present time the Commission advises concerning all projects within the realm of the Fine Arts with which the Federal Government is concerned in the District of Columbia. Recently the Commission called attention of the Members of Congress to the importance of giving more attention to the embellishment of our public buildings through the use of sculpture and mural painting. To this suggestion the members of Congress have given favorable response.

In the early days of the Republic, President Washington called a committee consisting of Messrs. James Hoban and Stephen Hallet, architects, Colin Williamson and Carstairs, builders, and Dr. William Thornton, to meet in Philadelphia for a conference concerning questions relating to the design for the United States Capitol. In the spring of 1825, during the administration of President John Quincy Adams, a "commission" consisting of Dr. William Thornton, Charles Bulfinch, Architect of the Capitol, C. B. King, portrait painter, and Colonel George Bomford, U. S. Army, assembled in the "Unfurnished" East Room of the White House to determine upon a design for the tympanum of the central east entrance of the Capitol. In 1836, during the Administration of President Jackson, a committee was appointed to advise concerning the four historical paintings (in addition to those by Trumbull) in the Rotunda of the Capitol. In 1859, Congress authorized the President to appoint an Art Commission of distinguished artists to advise on questions of sculpture and painting for the interior of the Capitol Building. President Buchanan appointed Henry Kirke Brown, sculptor, and James R. Lambdin and John F. Kensett, painters. This Commission, clothed with the veto power, was organized June 1, 1859; they submitted their only report February 22, 1860. A conflict between this Commission and the Congress resulted in an act terminating its existence.

The Senate Park Commission of 1901, the appointment of which was authorized by a Resolution of the United States Senate, consisted of artists who had taken a leading part in the Chicago World's Fair of 1893. Daniel H. Burnham and Charles F. McKim, architects; Frederick Law Olmsted, landscape architect; and Augustus Saint-Gaudens, sculptor.

Charles Moore, then Secretary to Senator James McMillan, became Secretary of the Commission. It was he who served as member of the Commission of Fine Arts for thirty years and as chairman for twenty-two.

The Chicago Fair, better known as the World's Columbian Exposition, caused a renewed interest in the Fine Arts throughout the country and Washington was the first city to profit by that awakening. The Senate Park Commission succeeded in rescuing the L'Enfant Plan from oblivion and, in a report subsequently published (Senate Document No. 166, 57th Congress), outlined plans for public buildings, parks, and other improvements. However, there was no existing official body to urge upon Congress the carrying out of these plans. In 1909 President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a "Council of Fine Arts" consisting of thirty artists, but after holding one meeting Congress expressed disapproval of it and it ceased to exist. Then, on May 17, 1910, during the administration of President Taft, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts, a body now thirty years old. Its record of accomplishment may be seen in the present state of development of the Nation's Capital, a record which stands eloquently for unselfish service on the part of a large group of distinguished American artists.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
and Their Years of Service

Architects

Daniel H. Burnham (1910-1912)
Chairman 1910-1912
Thomas Hastings (1910-1917)
Cass Gilbert (1910-1916)
Peirce Anderson (1912-1916)
Charles A. Platt (1916-1921)
William Mitchell Kendall (1916-1921)
John Russell Pope (1917-1922)
Louis Ayres (1921-1925)
Henry Bacon (1921-1924)
Milton B. Medary, Jr. (1922-1927)
William Adams Delano (1924-1928)
Abram Garfield (1925-1930)
Benjamin W. Morris (1927-1931)
John W. Cross (1928-1933)
John L. Mauran (1930-1933)
Egerton Swartwout (1931-1936)
John Mead Howells (1933-1937)
Charles A. Coolidge (1933-1936)
Charles L. Borie, Jr. (1936-1940)
Henry R. Shepley (1936-1940)
William F. Lamb (1937-1941)
Paul P. Cret (1940-1944)
John A. Holabird (1940-1944)

Sculptors

Daniel Chester French (1910-1915)
Chairman 1912-1915
Herbert Adams (1915-1920)
James E. Fraser (1920-1925)
Lorado Taft (1925-1929)
Adolph A. Weinman (1929-1933)
Lee Lawrie (1933-1937)
Paul Manship (1937-1941)

Painters

Francis D. Millet (1910-1912)
Edwin H. Blashfield (1912-1916)
J. Alden Weir (1916-1919)
William Sergeant Kendall (1920-1921)
H. Siddons Mowbray (1921-1928)
Ezra Winter (1928-1933)
Eugene F. Savage (1933-1941)

Landscape Architects

Frederic Law Olmsted (1910-1918)
James L. Greenleaf (1918-1927)
Ferruccio Vitale (1927-1932)
Gilmore D. Clarke (1932-1944)
Chairman 1937-1944

Lay Members

Charles Moore (1910-1940)
Chairman 1915-1937
Edward Bruce (1940-1944)

Total number of members 43

Total number of official meetings during thirty years..... 261